

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/625,999	DOERKSEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jason B. Dunham	3625	

**All Participants:**

(1) Jason B. Dunham.

(2) Elliott D. Light.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 13 February 2007

**Time:** 10:00 AM

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

N/A

**Claims discussed:**

1-3,5-7,9-16,18-20,22-33,35-43,75-77 and 79-81

**Prior art documents discussed:**

Bonneau (US 6,978,273) and Moore (US 2002/0143603)

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner indicated to Mr. Light that upon cancelation of claim 20 and Examiner's amendment to the remaining claims to more positively recited the novel features of the present invention, the application would be placed in condition for allowance. Mr. Light indicated that claim 20 should be canceled, claim 35 was to depend on claim 27, and the Examiner should proceed with the discussed amendments to the claims which better defined the historical transaction data as relating to transactions between the targeted recipient and the catalogue retailer.